arXiv:1403.6499v1 [stat.ML] 25 Mar 2014

Optimal Schatten-q and Ky-Fan-k Norm Rate of Low Rank Matrix Estimation

Dong Xia*

Georgia Institute of Technology
dxia7@math.gatech.edu

Abstract

In this paper, we consider low rank matrix estimation using either matrix-version Dantzig Selector $\hat{A}^d_\lambda$ as in (I.11) or matrix-version LASSO estimator $\hat{A}^L_\lambda$ as in (I.10). We consider sub-Gaussian measurements, i.e., the measurements $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ have i.i.d. sub-Gaussian entries. Suppose $rank(A_0) = r$. We proved that, when $n \geq Cm[r^2 \vee r\log(m)\log(n)]$ for some $C > 0$, both $\hat{A}^d_\lambda$ and $\hat{A}^L_\lambda$ can obtain optimal upper bounds(except some logarithmic terms) for estimation accuracy under spectral norm. By applying metric entropy of Grassmann manifolds, we construct (near) matching minimax lower bound for estimation accuracy under spectral norm. Note that, Candes and Plan [5], Negahban and Wainwright [18], Rohde and Tsybakov [20] proved optimal upper bound for estimation accuracy under Frobenius norm as long as $n \geq Cmr$ for some constant $C > 0$. We also give upper bounds and matching minimax lower bound(except some logarithmic terms) for estimation accuracy under Schatten-q norm for every $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. As a direct corollary, we show both upper bounds and minimax lower bounds of estimation accuracy under Ky-Fan-k norms for every $1 \leq k \leq m$.

I Introduction and an overview of main results

Low rank matrix estimation has been studied for several years in the literatures, such as Candes and Plan [5], Koltchinskii [10], Koltchinskii [12] and Klopp [9] with references therein. In the general settings, we have independent pairs of measurements and outputs, $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^{m_1\times m_2}, \mathbb{R})$ which are related to an unkown matrix $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1\times m_2}$. We assume A_0 has low rank, *i.e.*, $r = \text{rank}(A_0) \ll (m_1 \wedge m_2)$. The observations $(X_j, Y_j), j = 1, \ldots, n$ satisfy the trace regression model:

$$Y_j = \langle A_0, X_j\rangle + \xi_j, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n \tag{I.1}$$

where $\xi_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are *i.i.d.* zero-mean random noises with variance $\mathbb{E}\xi^2 = \sigma^2_\xi < \infty$. In this paper, we only consider sub-Gaussian noise, *i.e.*, $|\xi|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma^2_\xi$. The meaning of $||\cdot||_{\psi_2}$ and $\lesssim$ will be introduced later. $\langle A, B\rangle$ is used as notation for $\text{Tr}(A^TB)$ for any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1\times m_2}$. The task is to estimate A_0 based on the collected data $(X_j, Y_j), j = 1, \ldots, n$. Let $\mathcal{Y} := (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
We use Π to denote the distribution of *i.i.d.* measurements $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$, which are sampled from the measurements set $\mathcal{M}$. Distribution based dot product and L_2-norm are defined as

$$\langle A, B\rangle_{L_2(\Pi)} := \mathbb{E}\langle A, X\rangle\langle B, X\rangle \tag{I.2}$$

and

$$||A||^2_{L_2(\Pi)} := \mathbb{E}\langle A, X\rangle^2 \tag{I.3}$$

Several well-konwn measurements $\mathcal{M}$ and Π have been studied in the literatures, such as

*Thanks Vladimir Koltchinskii for refering this problem to me.

EXAMPLE 1. Matrix Completion In this situation, Π denotes some distribution on the set

$$\mathcal{M} = \{e_j(m_1) \otimes e_k(m_2), j = 1, \ldots, m_1, k = 1, \ldots, m_2\} \tag{I.4}$$

where $e_j(m)$ denotes the j-th canonical basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Most literatures considered Π as a uniform distribution on the set $\mathcal{M}$, see Koltchinskii [11], Koltchinskii et al. [13] and Rohde and Tsybakov [20]. Lounici [16] and Klopp [9] studied general sampling on $\mathcal{X}$ instead. Under the assumption of uniform distribution, the task means to estimate A_0 from randomly observed entries of A_0 which are corrupted with noises. Rohde and Tsybakov [20] also considered sampling without replacement from $\mathcal{M}$, i.e. $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are different from each other. A remark is that when Π denotes the uniform distribution on $\mathcal{M}$, we have $||A||^2_{L_2(\Pi)} = \frac{1}{m_1 m_2}||A||_2^2$ and $\langle A, B\rangle_{L_2(\Pi)} = \frac{1}{m_1 m_2}\langle A, B\rangle$.

EXAMPLE 2. sub-Gaussian Design In this situation, $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are *i.i.d.* designed matrices. The entries of every X_j are all *i.i.d.* sub-Gaussians. A real-valued random variable x is said to be *sub-Gaussian* with parameter $b > 0$ if it has the property that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ one has: $\mathbb{E}e^{tx} \leq e^{b^2t^2/2}$. In Gaussian and Rademacher cases, $||A||_{L_2(\Pi)} = ||A||_2$ and $\langle A, B\rangle_{L_2(\Pi)} = \langle A, B\rangle$. Koltchinskii [11] studied the sub-Gaussian measurements for estimating density matrices in quantum state tomography. Gaussian measurements are widely discussed in compressed sensing for the reason that, with high probability, Gaussian random sampling operator satisfies the *Restricted Isometry Property*, which will be introduced in Section II. Interested readers can read Baraniuk et al. [2], Candes et al. [7].

EXAMPLE 3. Rank One Projection As described in Cai and Zhang [4], both Example 1 and Example 2 have disadvantages. Under the matrix completion model, in order to get a stable estimation of matrix A_0, as pointed out by Candes and Recht [6], Gross [8], additional structral assumptions are needed. Actually, it is impossible to recover spiked matrices under matrix completion model. However, under sub-Gaussian sampling, every measurements $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ require $\mathcal{O}(m_1 m_2)$ bytes of space for storage, which will be huge when m is large. Therefore, Cai and Zhang [4] proposed the rank one projection, $X_j = \alpha_j^T \beta_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$, where $\alpha_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\beta_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are *i.i.d.* sub-Gaussian vectors. They proved that under rank one projection, one is able to construct a stable estimator without addition structral assumptions. In addition, only $\mathcal{O}(m_1 + m_2)$ bytes of space are needed for storage of every $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$.

sub-Gaussian Design. In this paper, we only consider sub-Gaussian design with introduction similar to Koltchinskii [11]. More precisely, we assume that the distribution Π satisfies that, for some constant $b_0 > 0$ such that for any $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2}$, $\langle A, X\rangle$ is a sub-Gaussian random variable with parameter $b_0||A||_{L_2(\Pi)}$. This implies that $\mathbb{E}X = 0$ and, for some constant $b_1 > 0$,

$$||\langle A, X\rangle||_{\psi_2} \leq b_1||A||_{L_2(\Pi)}, \quad \forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2}. \tag{I.5}$$

In addition, assume that, for some constant $b_2 > 0$,

$$||A||_{L_2(\Pi)} = ||\langle A, X\rangle||_{L_2(\Pi)} \leq b_2||A||_2, \quad \forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2}. \tag{I.6}$$

A random matrix X satisfying the above conditions will be called a *sub-Gaussian* matrix. Moreover, if X also satisfies the condition

$$||A||_{L_2(\Pi)} = ||A||_2, \quad \forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2} \tag{I.7}$$

then it will be called an *isotropic sub-Guassian* matrix. As was mentioned in Example 2, Gaussian and Rademacher random matrices belong to the class of *isostropic sub-Gaussian* matrices. It easily follows from the basic properties of Orlicz norms, van der Vaart and Wellner [25], that for

sub-Gaussian matrices $||A||_{L_p(\Pi)} = \mathbb{E}^{1/p} \langle A, X\rangle^p \leq c_p b_1 b_2 ||A||_2$ and $||A||_{\psi_1} := ||\langle A, X\rangle||_{\psi_1} \leq cb_1b_2||A||_2, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1\times m_2}, p \geq 1$ for some universal constants $c_p > 0, c > 0$.

To simplify our expressions, *W.L.O.G.*, we assume $m_1 = m_2 = m$. Let $\mathcal{X}$ denotes the following linear map:

$$\forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}, \mathcal{X}(A) = (\langle A, X_1\rangle, \ldots, \langle A, X_n\rangle)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \tag{I.8}$$

Therefore, when $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are random matrices, $\mathcal{X}(A)$ is a random vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for every $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$. The adjoint operator $\mathcal{X}^\star$ is given as

$$\forall U \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{X}^\star(U) = \sum_{j=1}^n \langle U, X_j\rangle X_j \tag{I.9}$$

Now we introduce some notations we will use in this paper. For $\forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$,Let $||A||_q$ denotes the Schatten-q norm for every $q \geq 1$, *i.e.*, $||A||_q^q = \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j^q(A)$, where we assumed that A has singular value decomposition as $A = \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j(A) u_j \otimes v_j$ with $\sigma_j(A), j = 1, \ldots, m$ arranged in non-increasing order. Therefore, $||\cdot||_2$ is Frobenius norm, $||\cdot||_1$ as nuclear norm and $||\cdot||_\infty$ as spectral norm. Another similar norms are Ky-Fan norms. Given any $1 \leq k \leq m$, the Ky-Fan-k norm is defined as $||A||_{F_k} := \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_j(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$. As described in Tao [23, Chapter 2], $||\cdot||_{F_k} : \mathbb{R}^{m\times m} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function for every $1 \leq k \leq m$. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we use $|v|_{l_2}$ to denote the l_2-norm, *i.e.*, $|v|_{l_2}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n v_j^2$.

We use $A_{\max(r)}$ to denote $A_{\max(r)} := \sum_{j=1}^r u_j(A) u_j \otimes v_j$. We also define $A_{-\max(r)} := A - A_{\max(r)}$. A cone $\mathcal{C}(r, \beta)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}(r, \beta) := \left\{ A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}, ||A_{-\max(r)}||_1 \leq \beta ||A_{\max(r)}||_1 \right\}.$$

Let $W := \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j X_j$. We use $x \gtrsim y$ to denote that $x \geq cy$ for some constant $c > 0$. Similar notation is $\lesssim$. Let $\mathcal{A}_r$ denotes the set of all matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ with $\text{rank}(A) \leq r$.
Based on the data $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$, several estimators of A_0 have been proposed. The following two estimators are well-studied in the literature. The first one is matrix-version LASSO estimator:

$$\hat{A}_\lambda^L := \underset{A\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}}{\arg\min} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\langle A, X_j\rangle - Y_j\right)^2 + \lambda ||A||_1, \tag{I.10}$$

where $||\cdot||_1$ is used as a convex surrogate for $\text{rank}(\cdot)$ to "promote" low rank solution. Readers can refer to Koltchinskii [10], Rohde and Tsybakov [20], and Klopp [9] for more details. Another estimator is Dantzig Selector

$$\hat{A}_\lambda^d := \underset{A\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}}{\arg\min} \{||A||_1 : ||\mathcal{X}^\star(\mathcal{X}A - \mathcal{Y})||_\infty \leq \lambda\} \tag{I.11}$$

Candes and Plan [5] proved that, under Gaussian measurements, when $n \geq Cmr$ for some constant C and $|\xi|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma_\xi$, if we choose $\lambda = C_1\sigma_\xi\sqrt{nm\log(m)}$ for some constant $C_1 > 0$, then

$||\hat{A}_\lambda^d - A_0||_2^2 \leq C' \frac{mr\sigma_\xi^2 \log(m)}{n}$ and $||\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0||_2^2 \leq C' \frac{mr\sigma_\xi^2 \log(m)}{n}$ with high probability for some universal constant $C' > 0$. They also showed that these upper bounds are optimal.
In addition, Lounici [16], Koltchinskii and Lounici et. al. [13] considered the following modified matrix LASSO estimator:

$$\hat{A}_\lambda^{mL} := \underset{A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}}{\arg\min} ||A||_{L_2(\Pi)}^2 - \left\langle A, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j X_j \right\rangle + \lambda ||A||_1 . \tag{I.12}$$

Under (near) matrix completion model and certain assumptions, optimal upper bounds (except some logarithmic terms) for estimation accuracy under both the spectral norms, *i.e.*, $||\hat{A}_\lambda^{mL} - A_0||_\infty$ and Frobenius norm *i.e.*, $||\hat{A}_\lambda^{mL} - A_0||_2$, are obtained in [16] and [13].
However, there are few results about estimation accuracy under the spectral norm, *i.e.*, $||\hat{A}_\lambda^d - A_0||_\infty$ or $||\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0||_\infty$. In this paper, we will give optimal(except some logarithmic terms) upper bounds for them under sub-Gaussian measurements. Unlike [5], our analysis requires $n \geq Cm[r^2 \vee r\log(m)\log(n)]$ for some constant $C > 0$ which requires higher order of r. The idea of the proof is similar to Lounici [15]. We state our main results as follows, some notations will be described in Section II.

Theorem I.1. *Suppose Π is a sub-Gaussian distribution and $n \geq Cm[r^2 \vee r\log(m)\log(n)]$ for some $C > 0$ and $|\xi|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma_\xi$, if $\lambda \gtrsim C_2\sigma_\xi\sqrt{nm\log m}$ for some $C_2 > 0$, then there exists some constant $C_1 > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - \frac{4}{m}$,*

$$\left|\left|\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0\right|\right|_\infty \leq C_1\sigma_\xi\sqrt{\frac{m\log m}{n}} \tag{I.13}$$

where $\hat{A}_\lambda$ can be $\hat{A}_\lambda^d$ and $\hat{A}_\lambda^L$. C_1 contains some constants related to distribution Π.

In fact, we can prove a further result by applying interpolation inequality.

Theorem I.2. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem I.1, there exists some constat $C_1 > 0$ such that, for every $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, with probability at least $1 - \frac{4}{m}$,*

$$\left|\left|\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0\right|\right|_q \leq C_1\sqrt{\frac{m\log(m)}{n}}\sigma_\xi r^{1/q} \tag{I.14}$$

and for any integer $1 \leq k \leq m$,

$$\left|\left|\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0\right|\right|_{F_k} \leq C_1(k \wedge r)\sqrt{\frac{m\log(m)}{n}}\sigma_\xi \tag{I.15}$$

where $\hat{A}_\lambda$ can be $\hat{A}_\lambda^d$ and $\hat{A}_\lambda^L$. C_1 contains some constants related to distribution Π.

The following Theorem shows that the previous bounds in Theorem I.1 and Theorem I.2 are optimal in the minimax sense, except some logarithmic terms.

Theorem I.3. *Suppose the i.i.d. noise $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\xi^2)$ and Π denotes sub-Gaussian distribution,$2r \leq m$, then there exists some universal constant $c > 0$ and $c' > 0$ such that for every $1 \leq q \leq \infty$,*

$$\inf_{\hat{A}} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_r} \mathbb{P}_A \left(||\hat{A} - A||_q \geq c\sigma_\xi r^{1/q}\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \right) \geq c' \tag{I.16}$$

and for any integer $1 \le k \le m$,

$$\inf_{\hat{A}} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_r} \mathbb{P}_A \left(||\hat{A} - A||_{F_k} \ge c\sigma_{\xi}(k \wedge r)\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \right) \ge c' \tag{I.17}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_A$ *denotes the joint distribution of* $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$ *when* $Y_j = \langle A, X_j \rangle + \xi_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$.

The proof of Theorem I.3 applied the metric entropy bounds of Grassmann manifolds, introduced in Section II.
The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce some preliminaries which will be needed in our proof, such as *Restricted Isometry Property with constant* $\delta_r \in (0, 1)$, *Empirical Process Bounds*, *metric entropy bounds of Grassmann manifolds* $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ and *rotation invariance* of sub-Gaussians. In Section III, we will prove the upper bound of estimation accruacy under Schatten-q norm for every $1 \le q \le \infty$, as long as the assumption that $\delta_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{r}$ holds. In Section IV, we will prove that, under sub-Gaussian sampling, the random operator $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies the assumption $\delta_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{r}$ with high probability when $n \ge Cm[r^2 \vee r\log(m)\log(n)]$ for some $C > 0$. In Section V, by applying the metric entropy bounds, we can construct a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}_r$ such that the minimax lower bounds in Theorem I.3 holds. In Section VI, results of numerical simulations will be displayed.

II Definitions and Preliminaries

In this section, we will introduce some definitions and preliminaries we need for our proof.
Sub-differentials of nuclear norm. Given $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$, $\mathrm{rank}(A) = r$ with singular value decomposition, $A = U\Sigma V^T$ where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times r}$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{r\times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times r}$, the sub-differential of the convex function $A \to ||A||_1$ is given as the following set, Watson [27]:

$$\partial||A||_1 := \left\{ UV^T + \mathcal{P}_{S_1^\perp}\Phi\mathcal{P}_{S_2^\perp} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m} : ||\Phi||_\infty \le 1 \right\} \tag{II.1}$$

where S_1 denotes the linear span of $\{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$ and S_2 denotes the linear span of $\{v_1, \ldots, v_r\}$. It is easy to see that for any $\Lambda \in \partial||A||_1$, we have $||\Lambda||_\infty = 1$ as long as $A \ne 0$.

Restricted isometry property, initially introduced by Candes and Plan [5], is defined as follows:

Definition 1. For each integer $r = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, the isometry constant δ_r of $\mathcal{X}$ is the smallest quantity such that

$$(1 - \delta_r)||A||_2^2 \le \frac{1}{n}||\mathcal{X}(A)||_{l_2}^2 \le (1 + \delta_r)||A||_2^2 \tag{II.2}$$

holds for all matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ of rank at most r.

We say that $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies the RIP with constant δ_r at rank r if δ_r is bounded by a sufficiently small constant between 0 and 1. We proved that RIP holds with high probability under sub-Gaussian measurements in Section IV. Our proof here is different from [5]. We obtain an upper bound for the empirical process $\sup_{||A||_2^2 \le [1/2,2], \mathrm{rank}(A)\le r} \left| \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \langle A, X_j\rangle^2 - \mathbb{E}\langle A, X\rangle^2 \right|$ while [5] applied an $\epsilon-$net argument to prove the RIP under Gaussian measurements. [5] proved RIP with higher probability than ours, however $\epsilon-$net argument is more complicated and cannot directly be applied to sub-Gaussian measurements. We will see later that, when we have an sharp upper bound of δ_2, we are able to derive an optimal upper bound for estimation accuracy under spectral norm. The following lemma is also due to [5]. We repeat their proof for self-containment.

Lemma 1. For integer $r, r' = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ and $r + r' \leq m$, suppose Assumption 1 holds for $\delta_{r+r'}$, then for any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ obeying $\langle A, B\rangle = 0$ with $\mathrm{rank}(A) \leq r$ and $\mathrm{rank}(B) \leq r'$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\left|\langle \mathcal{X}(A), \mathcal{X}(B)\rangle\right| \leq \delta_{r+r'}||A||_2||B||_2 \tag{II.3}$$

Proof. We can certainly assume that $||A||_2 = ||B||_2 = 1$. Otherwise, we can just rescale A and B, since (II.3) is invariant by scaling. Then according to definition of $\delta_{r+r'}$, we have

$$(1-\delta_{r+r'})||A \pm B||_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{n}||\mathcal{X}(A \pm B)||_{l_2}^2 \leq (1+\delta_{r+r'})||A \pm B||_2^2 \tag{II.4}$$

According to these two inequalities, it is easy to get that

$$\frac{4}{n}\left|\langle \mathcal{X}(A), \mathcal{X}(B)\rangle\right| \leq 4\delta_{r+r'} \tag{II.5}$$

□

Empirical Process Bounds. Our techniques of proof requires some inequalities of empirical process indexed by a class of measureable functions $\mathcal{F}$ defined on an arbitrary measureable space $(S, \mathcal{A})$. The following introductions are similar to Koltchinskii [11]. Let $X, X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be *i.i.d.* random variables in $(S, \mathcal{A})$ with common distribution P. One of these inequalities is the Adamczak's version of Talagrand inequality, [1]. Let $F(X) \geq \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}|f(X)|, X \in S$, be an envelope of the class. Then, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n f(X_j) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\right| \\ &\leq K\left[\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n f(X_j) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\right| + \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \left|\left|\max_{1\leq j\leq n}|F(X_j)|\right|\right|_{\psi_1}\frac{t}{n}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{II.6}$$

where $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^2 := \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\mathrm{Var}(f(X))$. For $\forall\alpha \in [1,2]$, $||f||_{\psi_\alpha} := \inf\left\{C > 0 : \int_S \psi_\alpha\left(\frac{|f(X)|}{C}\right)dP \leq 1\right\}$, where $\psi_\alpha(t) := e^{t^\alpha} - 1, t \geq 0$. Usually, ψ_2 is related to sub-Gaussian tails and ψ_1 is related to sub-exponential tails.

Mendelson [17] developed a subtle upper bound on $\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n f^2(X_j) - \mathbb{E}f^2(X)\right|$ based on generic chaining bound. Talagrand's generic chaining complexity, [22], of a metric space $(\mathcal{T}, d)$ is defined as follows. An admissible sequence $\{\Delta_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is an increasing sequence of partitions of $\mathcal{T}$ (*i.e.* each partition is a refinement of the previous one) such that $\mathrm{card}(\Delta_0) = 1$ and $\mathrm{card}(\Delta_n) \leq 2^{2^n}, n \geq 1$. For $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\Delta_n(t)$ denotes the unique subset in Δ_n that contains t. For a set $B \subset \mathcal{T}$, $D(B)$ denotes its diameter. Then, the generic chaining complexity $\gamma_2(\mathcal{T}; d)$ is defined as

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{T}; d) := \inf_{\{\Delta_n\}_{n\geq 0}}\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}\sum_{n\geq 0} 2^{n/2}D(\Delta_n(t)), \tag{II.7}$$

where the inf is taken over all admissible sequences of partitions. Talagrand [22] used the generic chaining complexities to characterize the size of the expected sup-norms of Gaussian processes. Actually, Talagrand [22] proved that for a Gaussian process G_t indexed by $t \in \mathcal{T}$, one has

$$c\gamma_2(\mathcal{T}, d) \leq \mathbb{E}\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} G_t \leq C\gamma_2(\mathcal{T}, d) \tag{II.8}$$

for some universal constant $c, C > 0$. Similar quantities as $\gamma_2(\mathcal{T}, d)$ are also used to control the size of empirical process indexed by a function class $\mathcal{F}$. Mendelson [17] used $\gamma_2(\mathcal{F}, \psi_2)$ to control the size of expected emprical process. Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a symmetric class, that is, $f \in \mathcal{F}$ implies $-f \in \mathcal{F}$, and $\mathbb{E}f(X) = 0$, for $\forall f \in \mathcal{F}$. Then, for some constant $K > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} f^2(X_j) - \mathbb{E}f^2(X)\right| \leq K\left[\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}||f||_{\psi_1}\frac{\gamma_2(\mathcal{F},\psi_2)}{\sqrt{n}} \bigvee \frac{\gamma_2^2(\mathcal{F},\psi_2)}{n}\right] \tag{II.9}$$

We will apply these empirical bounds to prove strong RIP of δ_2 for sub-Gaussian measurements.

Interpolation Inequality. For $0 < p < q < r \leq \infty$, let $\theta \in [0,1]$ be such that $\frac{\theta}{p} + \frac{1-\theta}{r} = \frac{1}{q}$. Then for all $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1\times m_2}$,

$$||A||_q \leq ||A||_p^{\theta}||A||_r^{1-\theta} \tag{II.10}$$

One proof of this inequality is given in Rohde and Tsybakov [20].

Metric entropy of Grassmann manifolds. The Grassmann manifold $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ is the collection of all subspaces with dimension k in $\mathbb{R}^m$. For any subspace $E \in \mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ we denote by P_E the orthogonal projection onto E. For any metric $d : \mathcal{G}_{m,k} \times \mathcal{G}_{m,k} \to \mathbb{R}$, an $\epsilon-$net of $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ is a subset Γ of $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ such that for any point $x \in \mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ can be approximated by a point $y \in \Gamma$ such that $d(x,y) < \epsilon$. The smallest cardinality of an $\epsilon-$net of $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ is called the covering number of $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ and is denoted by $N(\mathcal{G}_{m,k}, d, \epsilon)$. The metric entropy is the function $\log N(\mathcal{G}_{m,k}, d, \cdot)$.
For every $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, we define the metric $\tau_q : \mathcal{G}_{m,k} \times \mathcal{G}_{m,k} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\forall E, F \in \mathcal{G}_{m,k}, \tau_q(E,F) = ||P_E - P_F||_q \tag{II.11}$$

According to definition of Schatten-q norms, the metric τ_q is well defined. Pajor [19] proved that

Proposition 1. For any integers $1 \leq k \leq m$ such that $k \leq m-k$, for any $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and for every $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\left(\frac{c}{\epsilon}\right)^d \leq N(\mathcal{G}_{m,k}, \tau_q, \epsilon k^{1/q}) \leq \left(\frac{C}{\epsilon}\right)^d, \tag{II.12}$$

where $d = k(m-k)$ and $c, C > 0$ are universal constants.

Given any metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$, an $\epsilon-$packing is a subset $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \mathcal{G}_{m,k}$ such that for any $x, y \in \tilde{\Gamma}, x \neq y$, we have $d(x,y) \geq \epsilon$. The packing number of $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$, denoted as $M(\mathcal{G}_{m,k}, d, \epsilon)$, is the largest cardinality of an $\epsilon-$packing of $\mathcal{G}_{m,k}$. One can easily check that,

$$N(\mathcal{G}_{m,k}, d, \epsilon) \leq M(\mathcal{G}_{m,k}, d, \epsilon) \leq N(\mathcal{G}_{m,k}, d, \epsilon/2) \tag{II.13}$$

Rotation invariance of sub-Gaussians. The proof of the following lemma can be found in Vershynin [26, Lemma 5.9].

Lemma 2. Consider a finite number of independent centered sub-Gaussian random variables $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$. Then $\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_j$ is also a centered sub-Gaussian random variables. Moreover,

$$\left|\left|\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_j\right|\right|_{\psi_2}^2 \leq C\sum_{j=1}^{n}||X_j||_{\psi_2}^2 \tag{II.14}$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant.

III Spectral norm rate under general settings

In this section, we will prove the upper bound for estimation accuracy under spectral norm in general settings, as long as certain assumptions are satisfied. In the next section, we will show that these assumptions are satisfied with high probability under sub-Gaussian measurements. The assumption is related to the RIP constant δ_2. It is similar to the Assumption 2 in Lounici [15].

Assumption 1. $\delta_2 \leq \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}$ for integer $r \geq 1$ and some constant $\alpha > 1$. c_0 depends on whether we study $\hat{A}^d_\lambda$ or $\hat{A}^L_\lambda$. Actually we can choose $c_0 = 1$ for $\hat{A}^d_\lambda$ and $c_0 = 3$ for $\hat{A}^L_\lambda$.

According to Proposition 3, we see that Assumption 1 holds with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{m}$ as long as $n \geq C_1 m[\alpha^2(1+2c_0)^2 r^2 \vee \alpha(1+2c_0)r\log(m)\log(n)]$ for some $C_1 > 0$. Note that we need $n \gtrsim mr^2$ to get an optimal upper bound for spectral norm. However, $n \gtrsim mr$ is needed for stable estimation under Frobenius norm as in [5]. We are not sure whether $n \gtrsim mr^2$ is indeed required or some techiques are needed to get rid of one r. The following result is an immedate one from Lemma 1.

Corollary 1. When Assumption 1 is satisfied, for any A and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ with $\mathrm{rank}(A) = \mathrm{rank}(B) = 1$ and $\langle A, B\rangle = 0$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\left|\langle \mathcal{X}(A), \mathcal{X}(B)\rangle\right| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r} \tag{III.1}$$

The next lemma shows that when λ is able to hold the noise, $\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0$ belongs to some cone defined in Section I.

Lemma 3. Take $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda \geq 2||W||_\infty$, then we have

$$\left|\left|\mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0)\right|\right|_\infty \leq \frac{3\lambda}{2}, \quad \hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0 \in \mathcal{C}(r,1) \tag{III.2}$$

and

$$\left|\left|\mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}(\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0)\right|\right|_\infty \leq \frac{3\lambda}{2}, \quad \hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0 \in \mathcal{C}(r,3) \tag{III.3}$$

Proof. We prove (III.2) first. According to definition of $\hat{A}^d_\lambda$, we get that $\left|\left|\mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0) - W\right|\right|_\infty \leq \lambda$. Then we get $\left|\left|\mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0)\right|\right|_\infty \leq ||W||_\infty + \lambda \leq \frac{3}{2}\lambda$. Since $||\hat{A}^d_\lambda||_1 = ||\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0 + A_0||_1$ and, by Weilandt-Hoffman inequality, Tao [23], we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
||\hat{A}^d_\lambda||_1 =& ||\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0 + A_0||_1 \\
\geq& \sum_{j=1}^m \left|\sigma_j(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0) - \sigma_j(A_0)\right| \\
\geq& \sum_{j=1}^r \Big(\sigma_j(A_0) - \sigma_j(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0)\Big) + \sum_{j=r+1}^m \sigma_j(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{III.4}$$

Since $||\hat{A}^d_\lambda||_1 \leq ||A_0||_1$, we can get $\sum_{j=r+1}^m \sigma_j(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0) \leq \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0)$. Therefore, $\hat{A}^d_\lambda - A_0 \in \mathcal{C}(r,1)$. Now, we prove (III.3). According to standard convex optimization result, we know there exists some $\hat{V} \in \partial||\hat{A}^L_\lambda||_1$ such that

$$\mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}(\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0) := \sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle \hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0, X_j\right\rangle X_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j X_j - \lambda\hat{V} \tag{III.5}$$

Since $||\hat{V}||_\infty \leq 1$, we get that $||\mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}(\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0)||_\infty \leq ||W||_\infty + \lambda \leq \frac{3\lambda}{2}$. According to the definition of $\hat{A}_\lambda^L$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\left\langle \hat{A}_\lambda^L, X_j\right\rangle - Y_j\right)^2 + \lambda||\hat{A}_\lambda^L||_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j^2 + \lambda||A_0||_1 \tag{III.6}$$

Therefore, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle \hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0, X_j\right\rangle^2 + \lambda||\hat{A}_\lambda^L||_1 \leq& \left\langle \hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0, W\right\rangle + \lambda||A_0||_1\\ \leq& ||\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0||_1||W||_\infty + \lambda||A_0||_1\\ \leq& \frac{\lambda}{2}||\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0||_1 + \lambda||A_0||_1\end{aligned} \tag{III.7}$$

Which gives $2||\hat{A}_\lambda||_1 \leq ||\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0||_1 + 2||A_0||_1$. Then we repeat the same process as above and we have

$$||\hat{A}_\lambda^L||_1 \geq ||A_0||_1 - \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0) + \sum_{j=r+1}^m \sigma_j(\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0) \tag{III.8}$$

Since $||\hat{A}_\lambda^L||_1 \leq ||A_0||_1 + \frac{1}{2}||\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0||_1$, it is easy to get that,

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=r+1}^m \sigma_j(\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0) \leq \frac{3}{2}\sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0) \tag{III.9}$$

Therefore, $\hat{A}_\lambda^L - A_0 \in \mathcal{C}(r, 3)$. □

Lemma 4. Let Assumption 1 be satisfied. Then

$$\kappa(r, c_0) := \min_{\Delta\in\mathcal{C}(r,c_0)} \frac{||\mathcal{X}\Delta||_{l_2}}{\sqrt{n}||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_2} \geq c_1 := \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}} > 0. \tag{III.10}$$

Proof. Assume $\Delta \in \mathcal{C}(r, c_0)$ has singular value decomposition as $\Delta = \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j(\Delta)u_j \otimes v_j$. We know that, based on Assumption 1 and Corollary 1

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}||\mathcal{X}\Delta_{\max(r)}||_{l_2}^2 =& \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j^2(\Delta)\left\langle \mathcal{X}u_j \otimes v_j, \mathcal{X}u_j \otimes v_j\right\rangle + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\neq j}^r \sigma_i(\Delta)\sigma_j(\Delta)\left\langle \mathcal{X}u_i \otimes v_i, \mathcal{X}u_j \otimes v_j\right\rangle\\ \geq& \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}\right)\sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j^2(\Delta) - \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}\sum_{i\neq j=1}^r \sigma_i(\Delta)\sigma_j(\Delta)\\ =& ||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_2^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_1^2\end{aligned} \tag{III.11}$$

Therefore, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}||\mathcal{X}\Delta||_{l_2}^2 \geq & \frac{1}{n}\left\langle \mathcal{X}\Delta_{\max(r)}, \mathcal{X}\Delta_{\max(r)} \right\rangle + \frac{2}{n}\left\langle \mathcal{X}\Delta_{\max(r)}, \mathcal{X}\Delta_{-\max(r)} \right\rangle \\ \geq & ||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_2^2 - \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_1^2 \\ & - \frac{2}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_1||\Delta_{-\max(r)}||_1 \\ \geq & ||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_2^2 - \frac{1+2c_0}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_1^2 \\ \geq & \left(1-\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_2^2\end{aligned} \tag{III.12}$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that $||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_1 \leq \sqrt{r}||\Delta_{\max(r)}||_2$, since $\text{rank}(\Delta_{\max(r)}) \leq r$. □

Now we state our main theorem as follows.

Theorem III.1. *We choose λ as in Lemma 3 and let Assumption 1 be satisfied, if $\text{rank}(A_0) \leq r$, then*

$$||\hat{A}_\lambda^d - A_0||_\infty \leq c_d\frac{\lambda}{n}, \tag{III.13}$$

$$||\hat{A}_\lambda^d - A_0||_1 \leq c_d'\frac{r\lambda}{n}, \tag{III.14}$$

and for any integer $1 \leq k \leq m$,

$$||\hat{A}_\lambda^d - A_0||_{F_k} \leq c_d(1+c_0)\frac{(k\wedge r)\lambda}{n}, \tag{III.15}$$

where $c_d = \frac{3}{2} + \frac{3(1+c_0)^2}{2\alpha(1+2c_0)c_1^2}$ and $c_d' = \frac{3(1+c_0)^2}{2c_1^2}$. (III.13) and (III.14) are also true if we replace $\hat{A}_\lambda^d$ by $\hat{A}_\lambda^L$.

Proof. Our proof will use notation $\hat{A}_\lambda^d$, however, the method also works for $\hat{A}_\lambda^L$. According to Lemma 3, we have $\left|\left|\mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}(\hat{A}_\lambda^d - A_0)\right|\right|_\infty \leq \frac{3}{2}\lambda$. Let $\hat{\Delta}^d := \hat{A}_\lambda^d - A_0 = \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j(\hat{\Delta}^d)u_j^d \otimes v_j^d$. Therefore, we get

$$\left\langle \mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}\hat{\Delta}^d, u_1^d \otimes v_1^d \right\rangle \leq \frac{3\lambda}{2} \tag{III.16}$$

However, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}\hat{\Delta}^d, u_1^d \otimes v_1^d \right\rangle = & \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j(\hat{\Delta}^d)\left\langle \mathcal{X}u_j^d \otimes v_j^d, \mathcal{X}u_1^d \otimes v_1^d \right\rangle \\ \geq & n\left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}\right)\sigma_1(\hat{\Delta}^d) + \sum_{j=2}^m \sigma_j(\hat{\Delta}^d)\left\langle \mathcal{X}u_j^d \otimes v_j^d, \mathcal{X}u_1^d \otimes v_1^d \right\rangle \\ \geq & n\left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}\right)\sigma_1(\hat{\Delta}^d) - \frac{n}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}\sum_{j=2}^m \sigma_j(\hat{\Delta}^d)\end{aligned} \tag{III.17}$$

Therefore, we have $\sigma_1(\hat{\Delta}^d) \leq \frac{3\lambda}{2n} + \frac{1}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}||\hat{\Delta}^d||_1$. Meanwhile, with $\hat{\Delta}^d \in \mathcal{C}(r, c_0)$, we have

$$\left\langle \mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}\hat{\Delta}^d, \hat{\Delta}^d \right\rangle \leq \frac{3\lambda}{2}||\hat{\Delta}^d||_1 \leq \frac{3(1+c_0)}{2}\lambda||\Delta_{\max(r)}^d||_1 \leq \frac{3(1+c_0)}{2}\lambda\sqrt{r}||\Delta_{\max(r)}^d||_2 \tag{III.18}$$

According to Lemma 4, we have $\left\langle \mathcal{X}^\star\mathcal{X}\hat{\Delta}^d, \hat{\Delta}^d \right\rangle \geq nc_1^2||\hat{\Delta}^d_{\max(r)}||_2^2$. Together with (III.18) we get $||\hat{\Delta}^d_{\max(r)}||_2 \leq \frac{3(1+c_0)\lambda\sqrt{r}}{2nc_1^2}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_1(\hat{\Delta}^d) \leq& \frac{3\lambda}{2n} + \frac{1+c_0}{\alpha(1+2c_0)r}||\hat{\Delta}^d_{\max(r)}||_1 \\ \leq& \frac{3\lambda}{2n} + \frac{3(1+c_0)^2\lambda r}{2\alpha(1+2c_0)rnc_1^2} \\ =& \frac{\lambda}{n}\left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3(1+c_0)^2}{2\alpha(1+2c_0)c_1^2}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{III.19}$$

Therefore, $\sigma_1(\hat{\Delta}^d) \leq c_d\frac{\lambda}{n}$. Meanwhile, $||\hat{\Delta}^d||_1 \leq (1+c_0)||\hat{\Delta}^d_{\max(r)}||_1 \leq (1+c_0)\sqrt{r}||\hat{\Delta}^d_{\max(r)}||_2$. The upper bound for $||\hat{\Delta}^d||_{F_k}$ is just an immediate result. □

Applying the interpolation inequality as (II.10), we get the following corollary.

Corollary 2. Under the same assumptions of Theorem III.1, there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that for every $1 \leq q \leq \infty$,

$$\left|\left|\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0\right|\right|_q \leq C\frac{\lambda r^{1/q}}{n} \tag{III.20}$$

where $\hat{A}_\lambda$ can be $\hat{A}^d_\lambda$ and $\hat{A}^L_\lambda$.

IV Spectral norm rate under sub-Gaussian measurements

Based on the results in the previous section, we show the main theorem of this paper for sub-Gaussian measurements. Under sub-Gaussian measurements, we will see that Assumption 1 holds with high probability. The following lemma is an immediate result from Proposition 3 in Appendix B.

Lemma 5. Suppose $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are *i.i.d.* sub-Gaussian measurements and $n \geq C_1 m[\alpha^2(1+2c_0)^2r^2 \vee \alpha(1+2c_0)r\log(m)\log(n)]$ for some $C_1 > 0$, then with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{m}$, Assumption 1 holds.

The following lemma provides a choice of λ. The proof is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 6. Under the assumption that $n \geq C_1 m\log(m)\log(n)$ for some $C_1 > 0$, if $|\xi|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma_\xi$ and Π is a sub-Gaussian distribution, then for every $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-t} - \frac{1}{m}$ we have

$$\left|\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j X_j\right|\right|_\infty \leq C\sigma_\xi\sqrt{\frac{mt}{n}} \tag{IV.1}$$

for some constant $C > 0$, where C contains constant related to Π.

Now, we state the sub-Gaussian version of Theorem III.1.

Theorem IV.1. *Suppose $X_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian measurements, $|\xi|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma_\xi$ and any $\alpha > 1$, $c_0 = 1$ for Dantzig Selector, $c_0 = 3$ for matrix LASSO estimator. There exists some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that when $n \geq C_1 m[\alpha^2(1+2c_0)^2r^2 \vee \alpha(1+2c_0)r\log(m)\log(n)]$ and $\lambda := C_2\sigma_\xi\sqrt{mn\log(m)}$, with probability at least $1 - \frac{4}{m}$,*

$$\left|\left|\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0\right|\right|_\infty \leq c_d C_2\sigma_\xi\sqrt{\frac{m\log(m)}{n}} \tag{IV.2}$$

and

$$||\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0||_1 \leq c_d' C_2 \sigma_\xi \sqrt{\frac{m\log(m)}{n}} \tag{IV.3}$$

and for any integer $1 \leq k \leq m$,

$$||\hat{A}_\lambda - A_0||_{F_k} \leq c_d(1+c_0) C_2 \sigma_\xi (r \wedge k) \sqrt{\frac{m\log(m)}{n}} \tag{IV.4}$$

where $\hat{A}_\lambda$ *can be* $\hat{A}_\lambda^d$ *or* $\hat{A}_\lambda^L$ *with only* c_0 *different and* c_d, c_d' *are the same as Theorem III.1.*

Proof. According to Lemma 5, Assumption 1 is satisfied with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{m}$. With C_2 well chosen, we see that $\lambda \geq 2||W||_\infty$ holds with probability at least $1 - \frac{3}{m}$ from Lemma 6. Therefore, based on Lemma 3 and Theorem III.1, we can get our desired bound. □

The Theorem I.2 is a direct result of Theorem IV.1 by applying Corollary 2.

V Minimax Lower Bound

In this section, we will prove Theorem I.3. Suppose $2r \leq m$, consider any $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, by Proposition 1 and inequality (II.13), we know that $M(\mathcal{G}_{m,r}, \tau_q, \epsilon r^{1/q}) \geq \left(\frac{c}{\epsilon}\right)^{r(m-r)}$. Therefore, there exists a set $\mathcal{B} := \left\{P_{B_j} : B_j \in \mathcal{G}_{m,r}\right\}$ with $\text{card}(\mathcal{B}) \geq 2^{r(m-r)}$ and $\tau_q(P_{B_j} - P_{B_k}) \geq \frac{c}{2} r^{1/q}$ for any $j \neq k$. Based on $\mathcal{B}$, we construct the following set: $\mathcal{A} := \left\{\kappa P_{B_j} : P_{B_j} \in \mathcal{B}\right\}$ with $\kappa = c'\sigma_\xi \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}$ with a small positive constant $c' > 0$ which will be determined later.
For any $A_j, A_k \in \mathcal{A}, j \neq k$, we know that $\tau_q(A_j - A_k) \geq \frac{c\kappa}{2} r^{1/q}$. When $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\xi^2)$, we can get for any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
K(\mathbb{P}_A||\mathbb{P}_B) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_A}\left[\log\frac{\mathbb{P}_A}{\mathbb{P}_B}(X_1, Y_1, \ldots, X_n, Y_n)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_A}\left[\sum_{j=1}^n \left(-\frac{(Y_i - \langle A, X_i\rangle)^2}{2\sigma_\xi^2} + \frac{(Y_i - \langle B, X_i\rangle)^2}{2\sigma_\xi^2}\right)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_A|\Pi}\mathbb{E}_\Pi\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\langle A - B, X_i\rangle\,(2Y_i - \langle A + B, X_i\rangle)}{2\sigma_\xi^2}\right] \\
&= \frac{n}{2\sigma_\xi^2}||A - B||_{L_2(\Pi)}^2 \lesssim \frac{n}{\sigma_\xi^2}||A - B||_2^2
\end{aligned} \tag{V.1}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_A$ denotes the joint distribution of $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$ when $Y_j = \langle A, X_j\rangle + \epsilon_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$. The last inequality holds because Π is a sub-Gaussian distribution. From this inequality, we know that for any $A_j, A_k \in \mathcal{A}, j \neq k$,

$$K(\mathbb{P}_{A_j}||\mathbb{P}_{A_k}) \lesssim \frac{n}{\sigma_\xi^2}||A_j - A_k||_2^2 \leq \frac{2n\kappa^2 r}{\sigma_\xi^2} = 2c'mr \leq (mr - r^2)\log 2 \leq \log(\text{card}(\mathcal{A})) \tag{V.2}$$

The third inequality holds whenever c' is small enough. Then Theorem I.3 is an immediate conclusion by applying Tsybakov [24, Theorem 2.5]. Indeed, by applying [24, Theorem 2.5], we have

$$\inf_{\hat{A}}\sup_{A\in\mathcal{A}_r} \mathbb{P}_A\left(||\hat{A} - A||_q \geq c\sigma_\xi r^{1/q}\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}\right) \geq c' \tag{V.3}$$

for certain $c, c' > 0$. The minimax lower bound for Ky-Fan-k norm is similar by choosing $r = k$ and $q = 1$.

VI Numerical Simulations

In this section, we show the results of numerical simulations. Since (I.10) and (I.11) are equivalent for certain $\lambda > 0$, we only implement numerical experiments for $\hat{A}^L_\lambda$. I should point out that even our analysis for optimal upper bound of $||\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0||_\infty$ requires that $n \gtrsim mr^2$, our numerical experiments will show that $n \gtrsim mr$ is indeed enough. To solve the optimization problem (I.10), we will implement the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers(ADMM), Boyd et. al. [3], Lin et. al. [14]. (I.10) is equivalent to the following optimization problem:

$$\hat{A}_\lambda := \mathop{\arg\min}_{A=B\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}} \sum_{j=1}^n \big(\langle A, X_j\rangle - Y_j\big)^2 + \lambda||B||_1 \tag{VI.1}$$

ADMM forms the augmented Lagrangian:

$$L_\rho(A,B,Z) := \sum_{j=1}^n \big(\langle A, X_j\rangle - Y_j\big)^2 + \lambda||B||_1 + \langle Z, A-B\rangle + \frac{\rho}{2}||A-B||_2^2 \tag{VI.2}$$

ADMM consists of the iterations as in Algorithm 1. Many papers in the literature showed that ADMM has good covergence properties. In our numcerical experiments, we choose $n = 5mr$ and $\lambda = 7\sigma_\xi\sqrt{mn}$, where we fixed $\sigma_\xi = 0.01$ and $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma_\xi^2)$. The low rank matrix A_0 is constructed as a product of a $m * r$ Gaussian matrix and a $r * m$ Gaussian matrix. In our experiments, we implemented $m = 40, 50, 60$ and $3 \le r \le 25$, with 5 trials for every m and r. The measurements $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are random Gausisan matrices or Rademacher matrices. The numerical results in

Algorithm 1 ADMM Algorithm

Set up value of max_Iteration and tolerance $\epsilon_{\text{tol}} > 0$
Initiate random $A^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$, $B^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ and $Z^{(0)} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{m}\times\mathbf{m}}$, k=0
while k<max_Iteration **do**
$A^{(k+1)} = \mathop{\arg\min}_{A\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}} \sum_{j=1}^n \big(Y_j - \langle A, X_j\rangle\big)^2 + \Big\langle A - B^{(k)}, Z^{(k)}\Big\rangle + \frac{\rho}{2}||A - B^{(k)}||_2^2$
$B^{(k+1)} = \mathop{\arg\min}_{B\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}} \lambda||B||_1 + \Big\langle A^{(k+1)} - B, Z^{(k)}\Big\rangle + \frac{\rho}{2}||A^{(k+1)} - B||_2^2$
$Z^{(k+1)} = Z^{(k)} + \rho(A^{(k+1)} - B^{(k+1)})$
if $||A^{(k+1)} - B^{(k+1)}||_2^2 \le \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$ **then**
Reaching the tolerance. Return $A^{(k+1)}$ or $B^{(k+1)}$.
end if
k=k+1
end while
Return $A^{(k+1)}$ or $B^{(k+1)}$.

Figure 1 shows that under Gaussian measurements, we have $||\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0||_\infty \sim C\sigma_\xi\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}$ where C is betwwen 8 and 10. Since we choose $n = 5mr$, *i.e.*, $\sigma_\xi\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} \sim \sigma_\xi\sqrt{\frac{1}{r}}$, (1a) in Figure 1 shows that $||\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0||_\infty$ depends only on the rank of A_0.

In Figure 2, we show the behavior of accuracy by Spectral norm under Rademacher measurements. Similar to the results of Figure 1, estimation accuracy decreases as rank(A_0) increases.



(a) *Accuracy under Spectral Norm* **(b)** *Accuracy ratio under Spectral Norm*

Figure 1: *Accuracy (ratio) by Spectral Norm under Gaussian measurements. The number of measurements is* $n = 5mr$ *with* $3 \leq r \leq 21$ *and* $m = 40, 50, 60$*. The x-axis stands for the rank*(A_0)*. In (1a), the y-axis represents the average loss (5 trials) under spectral norm, i.e.,* $||\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0||_\infty$*. We see that the average loss decreases with rank*(A_0) *increases. In (1b), the y-axis represents the ratio between the simulation accuracy and theoretical order of accuracy, i.e.,* $\frac{||\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0||_\infty}{\sigma_\xi\sqrt{m/n}}$*. It shows that the ratio belongs to* $[8, 10]$*, remember that we choose* $\lambda = 7\sigma_\xi\sqrt{m/n}$*.*



(a) *Accuracy under Spectral norm* **(b)** *Accuracy ratio under Spectral norm*

Figure 2: *Accuracy by Spectral Norm (ratio) under Rademacher measurements. Similar to the results in Figure 1), the ratio* $\frac{||\hat{A}^L_\lambda - A_0||_\infty}{\sigma_\xi\sqrt{m/n}} \in [8, 10]$*.*

A Proof of Lemma 6

A well-known fact is as follows, Rudelson and Vershynin [21].

Proposition 2. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ be a sub-Gaussian matrix. There exists a constant $B > 0$ such that $||||X||_\infty||_{\psi_2} \le B\sqrt{m}$.

Proof of Lemma 6. We consider sub-Gaussian noise, *i.e.*, $|\xi|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma_\xi$. We know that,

$$\left|\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j X_j\right|\right|_\infty = \sup_{||U||_2\le 1, \mathrm{rank}(U)\le 1} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j \left\langle X_j, U\right\rangle.$$

Accroding to Proposition 3, there exists an event $\mathcal{E}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \ge 1 - \frac{1}{m}$ such that $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ satisfy the RIP with $\delta_2 \le \frac{1}{2}$, as long as $n \ge Cm\log(m)\log(n)$ for some $C > 0$. Now we fix $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ on the event $\mathcal{E}$ and define $K_U := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j \left\langle X_j, U\right\rangle$ for $\forall U \in \mathcal{U}_1 := \{U \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m} : ||U||_2 \le 1, \mathrm{rank}(U) \le 1\}$. This is a sub-Gaussian process indexed by $U \in \mathcal{U}_1$, since $\xi_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are *i.i.d.* sub-Gaussians. For any $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_1$, we have $K_U - K_V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j \left\langle X_j, U - V\right\rangle$. We konw that $\xi_j \left\langle X_j, U - V\right\rangle, j = 1, \ldots, n$ are *i.i.d.* centered sub-Gaussian random variables and $|\xi_j \left\langle X_j, U - V\right\rangle|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma_\xi |\left\langle X_j, U - V\right\rangle|$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. We apply Lemma 2 and get $||K_U - K_V||_{\psi_2}^2 \lesssim \sigma_\xi^2 \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle X_j, U - V\right\rangle^2 \le \sigma_\xi^2(1 + \delta_2)||U - V||_2^2 \le 2\sigma_\xi^2||U - V||_2^2$. Therefore, for every $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_1$, we have

$$||K_U - K_V||_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sigma_\xi ||U - V||_2 \tag{A.1}$$

By defining a distance $d(U, V) := \sigma_\xi||U - V||_2$ for any $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_1$, we apply van der Vaart and Wellner [25, Corollary 2.2.6], we get that

$$||\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U||_{\psi_2} \lesssim \int_0^{\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{U}_1)} \sqrt{\log M(\mathcal{U}_1, d, \epsilon)}d\epsilon \tag{A.2}$$

where $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{U}_1) = \sup_{U,V\in\mathcal{U}_1} d(U, V) \le \sqrt{2}\sigma_\xi$. It is easy to see that $M(\mathcal{U}_1, d, \epsilon) \le M(\mathcal{G}_{m,1}, d, \epsilon)$. According to Lemma 1, we know that $\log M(\mathcal{U}_1, d, \epsilon) \le \log M(\mathcal{G}_{m,1}, \tau_2, \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma_\xi}) \le m\log(\frac{C\sigma_\xi}{\epsilon})$. Put these bounds into the integral, we get that

$$||\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U||_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sqrt{m}\int_0^{2\sigma_\xi} \sqrt{\log(C\sigma_\xi/\epsilon)}d\epsilon \le \sqrt{m}\sigma_\xi \int_{1/2}^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\log(Cu)}}{u^2}du \lesssim \sqrt{m}\sigma_\xi \tag{A.3}$$

Therefore, we know that $||\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U||_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sqrt{m}\sigma_\xi$. Therefore, for some $C_1 > 0$ and for every $\rho, t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U \ge C_1 t\sqrt{m}\sigma_\xi\right) =& \mathbb{P}\left(\exp\{(\rho\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U)^2\} \ge \exp\{C_1^2\rho^2t^2m\sigma_\xi^2\}\right)\\ \le& \exp\{-C_1^2\rho^2t^2m\sigma_\xi^2\}\mathbb{E}\exp\{(\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U)^2\rho^2\}\end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

We can choose $\rho \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}\sigma_\xi}$ such that $\mathbb{E}\exp\{(\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U)^2\rho^2\} \le 2$ and we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{U\in\mathcal{U}_1} K_U \ge C_1 t\sqrt{m}\sigma_\xi\right) \le 2\exp\{-C_2t^2\},$$

for some $C_2 > 0$. By the definition of K_U, we get our desired bound. Since our analysis is conditioned on the event $\mathcal{E}$, there is an additional $\frac{1}{m}$.

□

B An Empirical Process Bound

Proposition 3. Suppose $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are *i.i.d.* sub-Gaussian matrices with distribution Π. Then, for an integer $1 \le r \le m$ and all matrix A with $||A||_2^2 \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 2\right]$, we have that for every $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle A, X_j \rangle^2 - \mathbb{E} \langle A, X \rangle^2 \right| \le C||A||_2^2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \vee \frac{mrt \log(n)}{n} \vee \frac{rm}{n} \vee \sqrt{\frac{rm}{n}} \right) \tag{B.1}$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant related to Π

Proof. We consider the following empirical process:

$$\alpha_n(r, T) = \sup_{A \in \Delta_r(T)} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle A, X_j \rangle^2 - \mathbb{E} \langle A, X_j \rangle^2 \right| \tag{B.2}$$

where the set

$$\Delta_r(T) := \left\{ A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} : \frac{T}{4} \le ||A||_2^2 \le T, \text{rank}(A) \le r \right\} \tag{B.3}$$

We want to obtain an upper bound of $\alpha_n(r, T)$.

According to the Adamczak's version of Talagrand inequality (II.6), there exists some constant $K > 0$ such that for any $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$\alpha_n(r, T) \le K \left[\mathbb{E}\alpha_n(r, T) + T\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{Tmrt \log(n)}{n} \right] \tag{B.4}$$

Here we used the following bounds:

$$\sup_{A \in \Delta_r(T)} \mathbb{E} \langle A, X \rangle^4 \lesssim \sup_{A \in \Delta_r(T)} ||A||_2^4 \le T^2 \tag{B.5}$$

where the first inequality comes from the fact $\mathbb{E}^{1/p} \langle A, X \rangle^p \lesssim ||A||_2$ for $p \ge 1$ as introduced in Section I. Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\left| \max_{1 \le i \le n} \sup_{A \in \Delta_r(T)} \langle A, X \rangle^2 \right|\right|_{\psi_1} &\lesssim \left|\left| \sup_{A \in \Delta_r(T)} \langle A, X \rangle^2 \right|\right|_{\psi_1} \log n \\ \lesssim rT||||X||_\infty^2||_{\psi_1} \log(n) &\lesssim rT||||X||_\infty||_{\psi_2}^2 \log(n) \lesssim rTm \log(n) \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

where we used well-known inequalities for maxima of random variables in Orlicz spaces, van der Varrat and Wellner [25, Chapter 2], and $||A||_1 \le \sqrt{r}||A||_2$ for any $A \in \Delta_r(T)$.
Now we try to get an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}\alpha_n(r, T)$. We apply Mendelson's inequality (II.9) for the class of functions $\mathcal{F}_r(T) := \{f_A(\cdot) := \langle A, \cdot \rangle : A \in \Delta_r(T)\}$.

According to the property of sub-Gaussiam matrices introduced in Section I, we know that $|f_A(X)|_{\psi_1} \lesssim ||A||_2 \le \sqrt{T}$. We also konw the following bound for Talagrand's generic chaining complexities in Orclize space:

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{F}_r(T); \psi_2) \le \gamma_2(\mathcal{F}_r(T); c||\cdot||_2). \tag{B.7}$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant, since $||A||_{\psi_2} \lesssim ||A||_{L_2(\Pi)} \lesssim ||A||_2$ as introduced in Section I. From Talagrand's generic chaining bound, we get that

$$\gamma_2(\mathcal{F}_r(T); c||\cdot||_2) \lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup_{A\in\Delta_r(T)} |\langle A, G\rangle| \leq \sqrt{r}T\mathbb{E}||G||_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{rTm} \tag{B.8}$$

where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1\times m_2}$ denotes standard Gaussian matrix. The last inequality comes from the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}||G||_\infty \leq \mathbb{E}^{1/2}||G||_\infty^2 \leq ||||G||_\infty||_{\psi_2}\sqrt{\log 2} \lesssim \sqrt{m} \tag{B.9}$$

where the first inequality comes from Jensen inequality and the last inequality comes from Proposition 2. For the second inequality, by the definition of $||||G||_\infty||_{\psi_2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left\{||G||_\infty^2/||||G||_\infty||_{\psi_2}^2\right\} - 1 \leq 1 \tag{B.10}$$

By Jensen inequality, we get $\mathbb{E}||G||_\infty^2/||||G||_\infty||_{\psi_2}^2 \leq \log 2$. Put these bound into (II.9), we get

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}_r(T)}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n f(X_j)^2 - \mathbb{E}f^2(X)\right| \leq CT\left(\sqrt{\frac{rm}{n}}\vee\frac{rm}{n}\right) \tag{B.11}$$

Therefore, we get that with probability at least $1-e^{-t}$ such that for some constant $C > 0$,

$$\sup_{A\in\Delta_r(T)}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \langle A, X_j\rangle^2 - \mathbb{E}\langle A, X\rangle^2\right| \leq C||A||_2^2\left(\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}}\vee\frac{mrt\log(n)}{n}\vee\frac{rm}{n}\vee\sqrt{\frac{rm}{n}}\right) \tag{B.12}$$

□

References

[1] R. Adamczak. A tail inequality for suprema of unbounded empirical processes with applications to markov chains. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 2008.

[2] R. Baraniuk, M. Davenport, R. D. Vore, and M. Wakin. A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices. *Constructive Approximation*, 2007.

[3] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 2011.

[4] T. Cai and A. Zhang. Rop: Matrix recovery via rank-one projections.

[5] E. Candes and Y. Plan. Tight oracle bounds for low-rank matrices recovery from a minimal number of random measurements. *IEE TRANS. Inform. Theory*, 2011.

[6] E. Candes and B. Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization.

[7] E. J. Candes, J. Romberg, and T. Tao. Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 2006.

[8] D. Gross. Recovering low-rank matrices from few coefficients in any basis. *IEE TRANS. Inform. Theory*, 2011.

[9] O. Klopp. Noisy low-rank matrix completion with general sampling distribution. *arXiv:1203.0108v2*, 2012.

[10] V. Koltchinskii. Oracle inequalities in empirical risk minimization and sparse recovery. *Lecture Notes in Math*, 2011.

[11] V. Koltchinskii. Von neumann entropy penalization and low rank matrix estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, 2011.

[12] V. Koltchinskii. Sharp oracle inequalities in low rank estimation. *arXiv:1210.1144v2*, 2012.

[13] V. Koltchinskii, K. Lounici, and A. B. Tsybakov. Nuclear norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion.

[14] Z. Lin, M. Chen, and Y. Ma. The augmented lagrange multiplier method for exact recovery for corrupted low-rank matrices. 2013.

[15] K. Lounici. Sup-norm convergence rate and sign concentration property of lasso and dantzig estimators. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 2008.

[16] K. Lounici. Optimal spectral norm rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion. *arXiv:1110.5346v1*, 2011.

[17] S. Mendelson. Empirical processes with a bounded ψ_1 diameter. 2010.

[18] S. Negahban and M. J. Wainwright. Estimation of (near) low-rank matrices with noise and high-dimensional scaling. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2010.

[19] A. Pajor. Metric entropy of the grassmann manifold. *Convex Geometry Analysis*, 1998.

[20] A. Rohde and A. Tsybakov. Estimation of high-dimensional low-rank matrices. *Ann. Statist.*, 2011.

[21] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. Non-asymptotic theory of random matrices: extreme singular values. *Proceeding of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, 2010.

[22] M. Talagrand. Majorizing measures: the generic chaining. *The Annals of Probability*, 1996.

[23] T. Tao. *Topics in random matrix theory*. 2011.

[24] A. B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*.

[25] A. van der Vaart and J. Wellner. Weak convergence and empirical processes. *Springer*, 1996.

[26] R. Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. 2011.

[27] G. Watson. Characterization of the subdiffential of some matrix norms. 1992.